

and reflect upon these last few years. I think back to my father, who left school when he was 13 years old, the end of eighth grade. He had to do that in order to get a job, in order to support his brothers and his sisters and his mother. He served in World War II and after the end of the war, a friend offered to lend him \$100 to get started in a tire repair shop. He jumped at the chance to take that loan and start that business because he saw that as his only opportunity to realize what we referred to, I guess, as the "American Dream."

What I remember about my parents is how hard they worked because they worked hard all of their lives. My father is no longer living. I can remember my mother even taking care of boarders in our house in order to help our family make ends meet. So if we measure success by how much money people accumulate or how many things they have, then we would not put my parents in the success category. They measured success another way. They believed in certain values. Those values were hard work and family and faith and individual responsibility, and they believed that in this country and in our society that if one works hard then anybody can have their chance to pursue their dream and their idea of success. They believed also that it was every generation's obligation to make sure that they passed that opportunity on to the next generation of Americans.

My sisters and I inherited more opportunities than my parents had. I got to go to college. I raised a family. I had a successful business. I have a terrific wife, three wonderful children, three delightful grandchildren. When I asked the people of Montana to elect me to represent them here, I told them that for me this was about our children and about our grandchildren.

The people in this country, the people of Montana, were frightened just a few years ago. They thought perhaps this idea, this American dream, was lost for generations to come, and the reason for that was their government. If we remember, we had deficits, \$250 or \$300 billion a year going forward as far as the eye could see. The national debt was approaching the size of our national economy.

Social Security and Medicare, two important programs, were in serious jeopardy. Medicare was scheduled to go to bankrupt.

It was not just a budget deficit that the people of Montana were expressing to me. They said there was another deficit, too, and that was the deficit in individual responsibility and personal responsibility that they saw in our society; a runaway welfare system; illegitimacy; broken families. The list goes on and on. We have made a lot of progress in the last few years on these important subjects. The fiscal house of

the nation is in better shape than it has been in a long time. We cut over 50 Government programs to help get us there. The budget is balanced, and it looks like it will stay balanced long into the future. Medicare at least is solvent for another 20 years. Social Security, we have ended 40 years of raiding the surplus in the Social Security trust fund, and that money hopefully will be set aside for generations in the future as well.

We lowered taxes for our families so that those families can make more decisions over how their money gets spent, empowering them to make better decisions as well.

This country is a unique place and it is based upon an idea, an idea, I guess we refer to it as the American dream, but it is also important for us to realize it is based upon principles of freedom and the principles of liberty, because that is how we pursue our dreams. That is why we are a creative nation, why we are entrepreneurial, why we are competitive and why this is such a dynamic place to live, is because of these freedoms and this liberty.

I have endeavored throughout my service here to promote those values, the values of competition, of freedom and liberty, to empower people and give people the power to make their own choices.

There are some people that I want to thank tonight, my wife, Betio; my mom, who watches C-SPAN religiously and thinks that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is the best Congressman, and I am second best; my children, Todd, Corey, and Mike; my grandchildren, Kadrian, Parker, Levy, and one on the way who is not named yet; my loyal staff who has worked so hard.

I especially want to thank the Members that I have served with here. What makes this such a special place, and sometimes I think people watching or listening misunderstand, is that the people carry such passionate views and so much caring about their constituents and the things they believe in to this floor and debate them on behalf of their constituents. I want to thank you all for your advice and your counsel, your help and your support and your encouragement; and finally I want to thank the people of Montana who temporarily entrusted me with this job, caretaker over this office. I want to thank them for the honor and the privilege they have bestowed upon me to represent them in this special place.

GOVERNOR BUSH'S TAX PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, our economic prosperity is fragile and the political reasons, the political rhetoric

out there in the country threatens to put that prosperity at risk. The Governor of Texas has mocked the importance of fiscal responsibility. It is in his political interest to tell the country that decisions made in Washington over the last 8 years have nothing to do with the economic prosperity that we have enjoyed over the last 8 years. Not only is he wrong but his statements lay the foundation for some very, very dangerous economic policies.

The Governor of Texas is correct that the lion's share of credit for our economic prosperity goes to American workers whose ingenuity, whose hard work, whose inventiveness are unparalleled; but for political gain, he denies that there is another essential element and that is fiscal responsibility here in Washington. When he denies that the Federal Government has anything to do with how our economy performs, he grants us here in Washington a license to be fiscally irresponsible, because if Government really has nothing to do with the prosperity over the last 8 years, then the Government is free to do whatever we want it to do without putting that prosperity at risk.

The facts are otherwise. During the mid-1980s, during the late 1980s, during the early 1990s, Americans were hard working. They showed ingenuity, did everything possible to give us prosperity and yet the country was not prosperous, and this is because we did not have fiscal responsibility here in Washington. Now for 8 years, the Clinton-Gore administration has insisted that we have fiscally responsible budgets; and prosperity has returned to this country. If we are told that those budgets have nothing to do with our prosperity, that lays the foundation for the kinds of huge \$2.6 trillion tax cuts that this country cannot afford, with the result that Government borrowing will swallow up private savings, returning us to high interest rates and recession.

The second aspect of the Governor's remarks that are clearly false is when he says that under his plan every American who pays taxes will get tax relief. He forgets that 15 million Americans pay FICA tax and do not pay any income tax and for these people, the people who clean up for us in restaurants, the people who take care of our old people in senior citizens' homes and nursing homes, people struggling to get by an \$15,000 and \$18,000 a year, he gives not one penny of tax relief because he is providing over 43 percent of the tax relief to the richest 1 percent of Americans; nothing for the janitors, everything for the billionaires. He ought to at least be honest enough to tell the country that that is what his tax policy provides.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when the Governor of Texas tells us that his plan will provide only \$223 billion of tax relief to the richest 1 percent over the next 10 years, he ignores everything he

is doing with the estate tax. He tells the country he is going to repeal the estate tax but never includes the fiscal effect of that repeal in his description of his overall tax and budget policies.

I can only refer to this as fuzzy fiscal figures and false fiscal facts. The fact is that the estate tax will be generating \$50 billion a year. That is \$500 billion over 10 years, which means under the Governor's proposal, the richest 1 percent of Americans will save over \$700 billion a year under the Governor's proposal. He admits to only \$223 billion. He ignores the other \$500 billion.

That is why it is true when it is stated that the proposals of the Governor of Texas would provide more relief to the richest 1 percent of Americans than he proposes to spend to improve our health care system, strengthen Medicare, strengthen the military, and improve education combined.

Mr. Speaker, our choice is clear. On the one hand, we can have fiscal responsibility, economic expansion, reduction and eventual elimination of our national debt and moderate tax cuts for working families, all combined with investments in education, Medicare, military preparedness and health care, or we can provide \$700 billion to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

THE PROBLEM WITH THE POLITICS OF DIVISION INSTEAD OF THE POLITICS OF UNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this, that under the plan proposed by Governor Bush, the janitor, the worker in the restaurant, would, in fact, get great sums of tax relief. But more importantly, rather than this class division, rather than the politics of envy, the Bush promise is to make that restaurant worker the restaurant owner. That is the biggest difference between the Bush vision and the Gore vision, which keeps the poor, poor. And that is the problem when we have the politics of division instead of the politics of unity. I think that is what this is all about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to talk a little bit about what we are doing here on a Sunday night, and joining me are my colleagues from Arizona, Michigan, Minnesota and Colorado; and we are going to ask the question, we are here because how much is enough, Mr. President? Last year the Labor and Education bill, Health and Human Resources, had a sum of \$96 billion.

□ 2130

This year, negotiating with the President, we are up to \$106 billion. But it is not enough for the President and Mr. GORE. They want more money.

So I will ask my colleague from Arizona, how much is enough? How much does the President want to spend?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, if my friend from Georgia will yield, that remains the question, because, the fact is, we are not getting a clear and compelling signal from the White House or from our friends on the left.

You see, we worked together to achieve a consensus in many areas, especially on the bill we passed just last week, which offered not only tax relief, but Medicare refinement and improvement to strengthen Medicare payments to hospitals and home health care facilities and nursing homes, but also something the President embraced when he came to Phoenix, Arizona, the so-called "new markets initiative." Community empowerment. So we had a very broad bipartisan piece of legislation there, and yet we hear now that the President says he intends to veto the legislation.

So, sadly, the answer to the question that my friend from Georgia poses tonight has no quantifiable answer.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first of all say that as I was stepping out of the Committee on Rules upstairs, I could hear without the electronic means my friend from Georgia talk about the fact that the Vice President is pursuing policies that will help to keep poor people poor, which I think is right on target. That is the one thing I heard, so I compliment the gentleman on offering the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and to congratulate my colleagues for the time that they are taking this evening to enlighten the American people on these very important issues.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), does he know how much is enough? I want to refer to our chart again. How much is enough, Mr. President? How much do you want to spend?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think what we are finding, especially in the area of education, where I have spent a lot of time and our subcommittee has spent a lot of time, it is no longer an issue about money, but, for the President, how much is enough? How much more authority does he want to move from a local and State level to Washington?

We know that he would love to start getting Washington involved in school construction, get Washington involved in hiring teachers. So for the President, it is not an issue of money anymore. Republicans have said we will match him on money.

"Enough is enough" now for the President is only when we move the decision-making for how we spend those dollars from the local level to the Department of Education here in Wash-

ington. That is now where the President is saying, "I need more and I want more."

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for that, because one of our major issues that is outstanding right now with the President is the fact that he wants school construction to be federally controlled; and we want to leave it locally controlled, where less dollars will be spent and local people will decide what needs to be built. It should not be in the hands of Washington bureaucrats.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough? That is the question of the evening. Well, I would suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that is really a moving target. We do not know, because the President insists upon every bill that comes down there, this much more, this much more. I think whatever the number was yesterday, it just increased by about 20 percent today.

But if one looks at why we are still here, and the gentleman from Michigan is absolutely right, this really is about whether or not you want to consolidate more power in Washington or whether you want to distribute power back to the people who live in our States and our communities, our families. That is the issue of the day.

PREPARING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get into this tonight, but I know my friends on the other side of the aisle are not intentionally attempting to mislead the people tonight, because I know them too well. I have worked with them on too many issues, and I think it is awfully important. Anything I say that any of them wish to challenge me on, I will be glad to yield some time, because I do not want to do that which I accuse you of doing.

When we start talking about how much is enough, I believe when we passed the foreign operations appropriation bill, those of you who voted for that voted to increase the caps for spending for this coming year to \$645 billion. Now, that is more than the President has requested to spend.

Therefore, when you start talking about the budget, the President originally this year called for \$637 billion in spending. My friends on the other side said you wanted to hold it to \$625 billion. The Blue Dogs suggested a good compromise in between at \$633 billion.

Our \$633 billion got 170 votes. In fact, we had 37 of you voting with us on that. Forty-one more of you and we would not be here tonight arguing